REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

In the Claims

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 14, 22 and 29 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1, 9, 14, 22 and 29. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 10, 14, 15, and 22. Applicant has canceled claims 6, 12, and 18.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctively claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended the independent claims 1 and 9 to address the examiner's rejection. Applicant has canceled claim 18.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-8, 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not a technological art.

Applicant has amended the claims such that the method is implement in a computing environment that incorporates at least one computing machine.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al. (US 6,795,967) in view of Ma et al. (US 5,920,725). Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's assertion.

Applicant acknowledges that all three methods do address maintaining a connection or establishing a connection with an application. However, Applicant's present invention maintains a connection to an object during a re-initialization of that

object. Evans maintains a connection to an application that has switched its' identity. Ma establishes a connection to a newly created object, then terminates the connection to the old object. Details of each process are described below.

Applicant's present invention provides a means that enables reference processes that have access to a long running object to maintain the current access to this object while this object performs a re-initialization operation in order to refresh data contained in the object. In operation, a reference program establishes a connection to the long running for purposes of accessing information in the object. This connection to the object is noted in the object manager. At this point, during the connection of the reference to the long running object, there is an event to trigger a re-initialization of the long running object. The object manager notifies the object of the trigger and holds the references that are connected to this object. The object receives the re-initialization signal, performs the re-initialization and sends a reply to the object manager. At this point, the object manager allows the references for the long running object to continue access to the long running object.

Evans (6,795,967) provides a method that notified applications of a change in the identity of an application. As stated an operating system registry contains multiple "identities." One of these identities is designated the current identity. When an application opens, it registers with an identity manager using objects known as "connection points." To switch identities, a user supplies the name of an identity to switch to. The identity manager then uses the registered connection points to query each of the applications for permission to switch identities. If all the registered connection points grant permission to switch identities, then the identity manager switches the current identity by changing information in the registry. The identity manager then notifies all applications, via their registered connection points, that a change to the registry has been made so that the applications can take appropriate action.

Ma (5,920,725) identifies switching from an old object to a new object. In this process, the application is not stopped so that updating of objects is transparent. A meta server catalogs all object classes for both the server and the clients. Modifications are specified by a run-time update tool and converted to change commands. The meta server

receives the change commands and updates the structure of an application database. Object class definitions are read from the meta server and modified by the meta server to access the new structure of the application database. The modified object-class definitions are written back to persistent storage for the meta server, and compiled and linked to form new object classes. An object adaptor receives a list of modified object classes from the meta server and notifies all server and client caches of the object classes on the list. The caches invalidate the obsolete objects and new objects are created using the most up-to-date class definitions. New references to the objects are sent to the new objects, although the old objects continue to process existing references until their reference count reaches zero and they are deleted.

Either Evans or Ma address conditions related to the re-initialization of a long-running object. Evans describes a method for maintaining contacts with an application when the application switches identities. Ma describes a method to switch to a new object from an old object. Evans does not teach or suggest any of the re-initialization techniques described in Applicant's present invention. The locations cited in the Evans by the examiner do not describe the steps of Applicant's present invention. Further, Ma does not discuss techniques related to the re-initialization of a long-running object. The re-initialization of an object is not the same as creating a new object, which is the focus of Ma.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness there must be teaching or suggestion or teaching to modify (combine) the cited references. In this present case, there is no suggestion or teaching to modify (combine) the references. Therefore, if there is no teaching, there is no pima facia case for obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below

listed telephone number. Applicants submit this response on October 31, 2005. A one-month extension petition has been filed with this response. The actual one-month response date was Sunday October 30, however, since this date fell on a Sunday, submission of this response to the above-listed date is considered a timely response. Please apply these charges or any credits, to Deposit Account 09-4447 (Reference Number ASU920011018US1).

Respectfully Submitted,

Darcell Walker
Reg. No. 34,945
9301 Southwest Freeway, Suite 250
Houston, Texas 77074
713-772-1255
October 31, 2005